



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

principally oriental forms as they were developed in Cyprus, the later show a preponderance of Rhodian and Ionic influence); xi, "The Figures with the *Etagenperücke*" (these figures, in which the hair appears as a wiglike mass in horizontal layers, represent a mode of wearing the hair which was introduced into Greece from Phoenicia toward the end of the eighth century B.C., probably through the mediation of Rhodes); xii, "The Significance of Early Cretan Art (Cretan art in the Dark Ages is Byzantine in character, i.e., an art which long preserved the traditions of an earlier and more splendid development, and which only rose to new importance when quickened by contact with the fresher, more living art of Ionia); xiii, "The Monuments and the Homeric Poems" (Helbig was more nearly right than Reichel and Drerup in turning to the monuments of the Dark Ages rather than to those of the Mycenaean Age for the study of Homeric *Realien*; in the poems, Phoenician influence is paramount in matters of art, and the monuments described show closer analogies to post-Mycenaean than to Mycenaean works; Homeric armor and Homeric dress, also, are best illustrated by the monuments of the post-Mycenaean period; the poems had their origin in some region of Asia Minor where oriental influence was strong).

Such a brief summary may suggest the wide range of Poulsen's investigations. It gives no idea of the wide knowledge and the keen observation that he everywhere displays. One is somewhat surprised to find no reference in the final chapter to Lang's theory of the "moment of culture," even if it were only introduced to be denied all probability. But such omissions are rare. In general, Poulsen's knowledge of recent literature seems no less comprehensive than his knowledge of the monuments.

For the archaeologist the principal value of this work will be found in the lists of monuments and the proposed criteria for distinguishing the products of different centers. The philologist will probably find the last chapter the most interesting. But the book deserves the serious attention of all who are interested in the fascinating problem of the origin of Greek civilization.

GEORGE H. CHASE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Apollonius Rhodius: The Argonautica. With an English Translation by R. C. SEATON, M.A. "Loeb Classical Library." New York: Macmillan, 1912. \$1.50.

Mr. Seaton has rendered the *Argonautica* into English prose that reproduces very closely the movement of the original. In point of diction he strikes a happy mean; the reader's attention is not arrested by obtrusive archaic forms, nor yet is the language wanting in dignity and elevation. The translation moves rapidly and carries the reader along easily. While it is closely made it has freedom as well, and shows on every page the art of

fusing mere words into a true English equivalent. The new translation is admirably suited to its purpose of winning readers for Apollonius.

Turning our attention to the left-hand page of the new volume we find a revision of the Oxford text of 1900. The changes in the Greek text are not many, but they show care and judgment. The proper name, Ἐριβώτης, wherever it occurs, e. g., i. 71, appears in its correct form, not as Ἐρυβώτης, a case where the inferior MS tradition kept something of value. In i. 103, κείνην is accepted instead of κουνήν, a case where the better MS tradition shows the lesser degree of corruption. There is a goodly array of readings that have been set in the text itself, instead of remaining among the probabilities or possibilities of the critical notes: i. 372, 811, 1099, 1187, 1216; ii. 274, and still others. One change that is in the direction of conservatism seems open to doubt. In iv. 336 the ἀκτάς of the inferior tradition is shielded by the corrupt ἀγτάς of Codex Laurentianus, a reading which implies ἀκτάς. Schneider's view that the corruption is at the end of the verse seems more probable. His text also makes this passage agree better with 514–16 where the Colchians are mentioned as establishing themselves on the mainland.

A few details of textual correctness deserve attention. Since Apollonius regularly lengthens before a mute and liquid it is better to follow L in omitting ν movable in iv. 986, 1496. In iii. 970 L has ὑπὸ ριπῆς, not ὑπαί. In ii. 1229 the text should be corrected accordingly. A parallel correction is actually made in iv. 1735. Why not follow Brunck in extending the principle to iv. 1159, 1613? In iv. 723 all MSS have ἰδρύθησαν, not ἰδρύνθησαν, and on the point involved L supports this form in iv. 532, although not in iii. 1269. The form without ν is found in the better MSS of Theocritus xiii. 28, and in a papyrus text of the *Iliad*, iii. 78. I once made a plea, on the score of epic usage, for the form Περτεφόνη, as against Φερτεφόνη of the MSS in ii. 916 (*Proc. Am. Phil. Assn.*, XXXIII, lx). The correct form of this word, so far as concerns the various types of poetry, has since then been discussed by Keil, *Hermes*, XLIII, 536–37, without any reference however to the passage in Apollonius. The facts as Keil exhibits them leave us two alternatives: either Apollonius believed that a form beginning with Φ was Homeric, having such a type of Homeric text in mind as is represented by the corrections to Ven. A of the *Iliad*, ix. 457; or, our MS tradition of Apollonius has been corrupted by the current Hellenistic form. The latter alternative still seems to me more probable.

As regards the translation: iii. 290 and 1131 are so much alike that one wonders why θυμόν of the former passage should not be emended to θυμός. iii. 117, "playing for golden dice," not "with," is almost convincing. But it puts an unusual strain upon the verb, as if it were a verb of striving. iii. 1060, τοτό γ' ἔκητι is rendered "thereupon." While this is a faint rendering of the Greek, one cannot question its correctness. I hesitate to accept Way's spirited "if this be all," because τοῦ would then refer to κῶας, which seems harsh. In iv. 741, the aorist infinitive is capable of its ordinary mean-

ing and need not be taken as a future. A parallel case, iv. 15, *ληθέμεν* is correctly rendered as a present rather than a future. A vexed passage, iv. 1487–88, is briefly treated in a footnote. The following is offered as a different approach to the difficulty. (1) The clause introduced by *τόφρα* is final, as in iii. 807. (2) *ἔων μῆλων πέρι* is a Homeric reminiscence (*Od.* xi. 403) and relates to an aggressor, striving for a piece of plunder. Therefore this prepositional phrase does not go with *ἀλεξόμενος*. (3) The word-order is important: between the subject of the verb and the verb itself are inserted the object, Canthus, the fight which he makes, and the purpose of the fight; then come further particulars about the subject. The difficulty, then, lies in the absence of a participle like the Homeric *μαχεούμενον* which is needed to help out the prepositional phrase. It is at least conceivable that Apollonius wrote the sentence as it stands and left the prepositional phrase “in the matter of his sheep” unsupported by a participle: “who in defending himself slew you with the cast of a stone, you who strove for his sheep that you might bring them to your needy comrades.” In any case, the first part of Merkel’s critical note seems to me the more valuable part, where he agrees with Schneider in removing the prepositional phrase from the nominative participle.

There are many difficult places where Mr. Seaton’s translation shows how he deals with disputed points. It would lead one too far afield to pass these in review. Suffice it to say that the translation as a whole is a most welcome interpretation of the *Argonautica*.

EDWARD FITCH

HAMILTON COLLEGE

Kleine Schriften, mit einem Bildniss und zwei Tafeln. Von ALBRECHT DIETERICH. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. M. 14.

After Albrecht Dieterich’s death in the summer semester of 1908 many of his friends and associates expressed the hope that the more important of his scattered articles might be brought together and reprinted in available form. The work was undertaken by Richard Wünsch, Dieterich’s successor in the conduct of the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, who has given us a stout volume as a memorial of his friend. None of Dieterich’s larger works—*Abraxas* (1891), *Nekyia* (1893), *Die Grabschrift des Aberkios* (1896), *Pulcinella* (1897), *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (1903, 1910²), and *Mutter Erde* (1905)—is here included, and of his numerous contributions to the *Realencyclopädie* only the “Aischylos” and the “Euripides” are reprinted, but the thirty numbers given display abundantly the interests, enthusiasm, and scholarship of their author. In date these papers range from that of the opening article, “Papyrus Magica, Prolegomena,” which Dieterich developed from his doctoral dissertation and published in the *Jahrbücher für Klassische Philologie*, Suppl. Bd. XVI (1888), pp. 749 ff., to the last two articles, “Der Ritus der